

## Remarks

The title is objected to. Claims 1, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (JP 4-278922) in view of Umemoto et al. (US 6,199,995).  
5 Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (JP 4-278922) in view of Umemoto et al. (US 6,199,995) and further in view of Fukui et al. (US 5,980,054). Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)  
10 as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (JP 4-278922) in view of Umemoto et al. (US 6,199,995) and further in view of Ohara et al. (US 5,844,720) and Nyborg (US 5,451,286).

### 1. Objection to the title:

15 The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "Method of performing a uniform illumination pattern in a back-light plate using a press".  
20

### Response:

The title of this invention has been changed to the title suggested by the examiner. Acceptance of the new title is requested.  
25

### 2. Rejection of claims 1, 3, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (JP 4-278922) in view of Umemoto et al. (US 6,199,995) for reasons of record,  
30 as recited on pages 2-3 of the above-indicated Office action (part of paper no.8).

**Response:**

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Specifically, claim 1 now states that the press is a roller,  
5 with the circumference of the roller being equal to or greater than the length of the back-light plate. The claim amendment is supported from Fig.2 and the corresponding specification of the 2nd paragraph of the detailed description. No new matter is added.

10 As shown in Fig.3, along the longitudinal axis of the back-light plate 30, the area of the recess 36 is designed larger at the two end portions, and the area of the recess 36 is designed smaller at the center portion. To produce  
15 the back-light plate 30 shown in Fig.3, the circumference of the roller 22 must be larger than the length W2 of the back-light plate 30 to avoid producing any larger recess 36 in the center portion.

20 As the examiner states in page 4 of the Office action, the "device of Suzuki in view of Umemoto does not disclose using a roller to form the recesses". Furthermore, while Fukui et al. (US 5,980,054) mentions the word "roller" in passing, Fukui does not teach or suggest that the  
25 circumference of the roller should be equal to or greater than the length of the back-light plate. There is no motivation given by Suzuki, Umemoto, or Fukui to suggest using a roller having a circumference equal to or greater than the length of the back-light plate to form recesses  
30 on the back-light plate.

Therefore, the present invention according to the

currently amended claim 1 is not obvious over the combination of Suzuki, Umemoto, and Fukui. Reconsideration of claim 1 is hereby requested. Claims 3 and 5 are both dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.  
5 Reconsideration of claims 3 and 5 is therefore requested.

3. Rejection of claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (JP 4-278922) in view of Umemoto et al. (US 6,199,995) and further in view of Fukui et al. (US 5,980,054) for reasons of record, as recited on pages 3-4 of the above-indicated Office action (part of paper no.8).

15 **Response:**

Claim 4 has been cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration. Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 2 is hereby requested.

20

4. Rejection of claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (JP 4-278922) in view of Umemoto et al. (US 6,199,995) and further in view of Ohara et al. (US 5,844,720) and Nyborg (US 5,451,286) for reasons of record, as recited on page 4 of the above-indicated Office action (part of paper no.8).

25 **Response:**

Claims 6-7 have been cancelled, and are no longer in need of consideration. Claim 5 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration

of claim 5 is hereby requested.

5

Respectfully submitted,

10 Winston Hsu Date: 6/18/2003

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No.41,526

P.O. BOX 506

Merrifield, VA 22116

U.S.A.

15 e-mail: winstonhsu@naipo.com.tw